the promulgation of DPCO, 87. Further, there has been upward revision in other variables like CC, PC etc.

(d) No, Sir.

(f) Does not arise.

Price decontrolled products

4594. SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) what are the increase percentages in prices of price decontrolled products like Daonil, Calmpose Tablets, Benadryl, Dilosyn, Suganuil Coscopin, Linctus, Pethidine Injection, Esgipyrin at present as compared to price before August, 1987;

(b) what is the price per pack at present and what was it before the DPCO 1987;

(c) what is the name of producer of each product;

(d) what are the names of producers who submitted break up before increase in cost and MAPE taken in each case;

(e) what is the name of bulk drug on which each product is based; and

(f) what is the basis of further liberalisation on the same?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (e) To the extent available, information has been given in the Annexure. [*See* Appendix CLXIV, Annexure No. 83]

(f) The review of the Drug Policy 1986 is still to be finalized.

Resignation by Director of IDPL

4595. SHRIMATI KAMLA SINHA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to unstarred Question 3072 given in the Rajya Sabha on 19th December, 1991 and state:

(a) whether Director Marketing of IDPL was involved in serious allegations prior to his resignation ostensibly for personal reasons in June, 1989;

(b) whether the allegation pertained to the supply of Oxytetracycline bulk material;

(c) whether the allegations were got investigated including those against the Executive Director (Vig.) IDPL; and

(d) whether his exist was attributable to these serious allegations, which stood reasonably proved, and he contrived to tender and get accepted his resignation though he had still $3\frac{1}{2}$ years to complete his tenure?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) The former Director (Marketing), IDPL had resigned on personal grounds in June, 1989. There were no special circumstances attached to the resignation of the then director (Marketing).

(b) to (d) In view of the reply to (a) above, these questions do not arise.

Unauthorised absence of 14 employees of IDPL

4596. SHRI MD. SALIM: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1121 given in the Rajya Sabha on 7th May, 1992 and state:

(a) out of the fourteen employees, who were listed as having been on unauthorised absence on 30th March, 1990 how many were not charge sheeted under rule 30-A together with reasons therefor;

(b) the number of cases in which they were reinstated without charge sheeting them and the period for which emoluments were paid to them despite their unauthorised absence together with reasons therefor; and

(c) what are the names and designation of 8 employees who were charge sheeted under Rule 30-A?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) As reported by IDPL, out of the total 14 officials on absence as on 30.3.1990, 9 officials were not charge sheeted under Rule 30-A. IDPL Management had initiated action under 30-A against those employees who had been on unauthorised absence for 30 days and more and who continued to defy the orders of the Management.

(b) The question of reinstating in service arises only in respect of such employees who have been suspened/ dismissed or removed from service. An employee who had not been dismissed or removed from service is very much on the rolls of the company and the question of reinstating him does not arise. In case of unauthorised absence, he is to report back for duty. Once the employee reports on duty, the Management can take a sympathetic view and his unauthorised absence can be regularised by grant of leave to the extent due and he becomes entitled to leave salary for that period.

(c) The names and designation of the 8 employees against whom action was taken under Rule 30 A are as follows:

S/Shri

1. Kamal Bhasin, Marketing Executive
2. K. D. Gupta, Senior Divisional Manager
3. R. K. Shewaramani, Medical Representative.
4. R. Mondal, Medical Representative
5. Anurag Gupta, Medical Representative
6. R. K. Handa, Medical Representative
7. V. K. Wadhera, Medical Representative
8. Ashish Mukherjee, Medical Representative

Two rules dealing with unauthori Absence

4597. SHRI MD. SALIM:

Will the PRIME MINISTER pleased to refer to Unstarred Qu tion 2283 given in the Rajya Sa on 12th March, 1992 and state:

(a) whether two rules viz. 5 and 30-A, for dealing with unau rised absence from duty in the C duct, Discipline and Appeal Ru 1978 of IDPL are to applied sele vely at the discretion of the mana ment or there are any procedural tructions on the subject for the gu ance of the disciplinary authoriti

(b) whether the management ar rarily switched over from proceed under rule 5(7) ibid to rule 30 A the middle of proceedings under r 5 (7) in few cases and in some ot cases proceedings were simultaneou carried on under both Rule 5 (7) a Rule 30-A for the same offence;

(c) whether in all the above cases, the rule enunciated earlier the Supreme Court has been appl by the management of IDPL by course to the less harsh of the t rules namely 5 (7) instead of R 30-A; and

(d) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN T MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AI FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA M HAN): (a) Rule 5 of the IDPL, C duct, Disciplinary & Appeal Ru 1978 only lists the type of misc duct for wihch an employee is lia to disciplinary action. The list is ustrative and not conclusive. Un thorised absence for more than days is one of such misconduct wh will render an employee liable to